

REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-28, 35-46, 48-50, 52-64, and 71-92 are pending in the application upon entry of this amendment. The independent claims include claim 1, reciting a computer-readable medium storing a computer application workspace generation and navigation tool, and claim 37 reciting a corresponding method. Computer-readable medium claims 1, 2, 12, 13, and 18, and corresponding method claims 37, 38, 48, 49, and 54, have been amended herein for the reasons set forth below. Minor amendments to other claims also have been made for consistency. Additional independent claims include new claims 75 and 77 reciting features comparable to claims 3 and 39 in independent form, and new claims 79 and 86 reciting features comparable to claims 18 and 54 in independent form. Related new dependent claims also have been added.

A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is being submitted herewith to obtain entry and consideration of the claim amendments. Favorable reconsideration is requested in view of the claim amendments and following remarks.

I. OVERVIEW OF THE CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Independent claims 1 and 37 have been amended to further recite the nature of the claimed screens as being individually selectable navigation units within the continuous logical main application workspace. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite: “each logical screen is individually selectable for navigation within the logical main application workspace.” In addition, claim 1 has been amended to recite code that “moves, by user action, the logical main application workspace from an area displaying a currently displayed one of the logical screens in the physically viewable work area to an area displaying a selected one of the logical screens in the physically viewable work area, the selected area of one of the logical screens being any user selected screen area in the logical main application workspace.” Comparable amendments have been made to independent method claim 37.

Support for these amendments may be found in the application at least at paragraphs [0060-0061], [0065-0066], and [0076-0077], which describe various ways

for individually selecting a particular screen for navigation. For example, an individual screen may be selected from a navigation box 84, and upon such selection the viewable area will be moved in a “quantum” type display transition to the selected screen. (Application at paragraph [0060].) In this vein, dependent claims 18 and 54 have been amended to recite in part generating “a navigation box that includes a representation of the continuous logical application workspace and including an indication of each logical screen within the workspace.” (See also new claims 79 and 86.) In this manner, screens as represented in the navigation box are individually selectable for navigation from the navigation box. As another example, an individual screen selection may be employed using a drop down menu. (See Application at paragraphs [0065-0066].) By various ways, therefore, each logical screen is individually selectable for navigation within the logical application workspace, as recited in amended claims 1 and 37. Furthermore, the selected logical screen may be a screen anywhere in the logical main application workspace, resulting in a display transition from a currently displayed logical screen to the selected logical screen by jumping over or skipping intervening screens.

In addition, dependent computer-readable medium claims 2, 12, and 13, and corresponding method claims 38, 48, and 49, have been amended to further recite the manner by which sub-application windows are associated with the logical screens within the logical application workspace. For example, claim 2 has been amended to recite: “code that logically associates a plurality of sub-application windows with respective locations logical screens within the logical main application workspace.” Claims 12 and 13 similarly have been amended to clarify that sub-application windows are associated with logical screens within the main application workspace, and comparable amendments have been made to method claims 38, 48, and 49. Support for such claim amendments may be found in the application at least at paragraphs [0045] and [0052].

The features of the various claim amendments provide for enhanced access to content within the continuous logical main application workspace. As illustrated above, each logical screen is individually selectable for navigation, and sub-application

windows may be logically associated with respective screens. A user, therefore, may employ the navigation capabilities and the association of screens with content to efficiently navigate to any content location within the logical application workspace.

As further explained below, the references cited by the Examiner do not disclose or suggest the features of the current claim amendments. In particular, the cited references do not disclose or suggest: (1) each logical screen is individually selectable for navigation, and the selected screen can be located anywhere within the logical main application workspace (claims 1 and 37); (2) associating a plurality of sub-application windows with respective logical screens within the logical main application workspace (claims 2, 12, 13, 38, 48, and 49), including the ability to employ such association to expand the size of the workspace by dragging a sub-application window to a new location outside the current dimensions of the continuous logical application workspace (claims 3, 4, 39, and 40; and new claims 75-78); and (3) a navigation box that includes a representation of the continuous logical main application workspace including an indication of each logical screen within the workspace (claims 18 and 54; and new claims 79 and 86), or a drop down menu from which a user can select any one of the plurality of logical screens (claims 25 and 61). The rejections, therefore, should be withdrawn.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b)/103(a)

Claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-19, 21-24, 26, 35-46, 48-50, 52-55, 57-60, 62, and 71-74 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dauerer et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,841,435 (Dauerer). The other claims stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Dauerer in view of Anderson et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0189597 (Anderson). Dauerer is a newly cited reference, and Anderson has been applied in previous Office Actions. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of the references.

The system of Dauerer, the base reference for all rejections, provides a virtual workspace larger than a viewable area. As depicted in Fig. 3 of Dauerer, the virtual workspace can be a multiple of a physical display 54 arranged in an "array", such as the

3 x 3 array depicted in Fig. 3. (Dauerer at col. 4, lines 38-43.) The generation of a workspace based on multiples of a physical display bears some similarity to aspects of the claimed screens, and the Examiner indeed equates the two. The nature of the purported screens of Dauerer, however, differs substantially from the nature of the claimed logical screens.

A. *Screens That Are Individually Selectable For Navigation*

As stated above, amended claims 1 and 37 recite that each logical screen is individually selectable for navigation within the logical main application workspace. Amended claims 1 and 37 further recite moving the main application workspace from displaying a currently displayed logical screen to displaying a selected logical screen, the selected logical screen being any screen in the logical main application workspace.

The purported screens of Dauerer lack such features. Dauerer's principal usage of the concept of multiple display areas is in connection with the described "Define Virtual Area" function. Such function merely permits a user to initially define the workspace as a multiple of the physical display area. (Dauerer at col. 5, lines 32-46.) In contrast to the claimed invention, however, after the initial definition of the workspace the system of Dauerer does not employ a "screens" concept for navigating the workspace by individually selecting a particular screen positioned anywhere within the logical main application workspace.

Dauerer describes various ways for navigating the workspace, including a "Move Physical Display Within Virtual Area" function, and a "Move Display Objects" function. (See, e.g., col. 6, lines 10-29; col. 7, lines 7-18.) No such functions employ a screens concept comparable to the claimed invention. Indeed, Figs. 4-12 of Dauerer, depicting the various navigation operations, all lack the grid of multiple display areas shown in Fig. 3. Such grid is lacking because none of the various navigation mechanisms described by Dauerer relies upon a screens concept by which the screens are individually selectable for navigation. The only navigation mechanism of Dauerer that is based on a display-sized area is the "Discreet Physical Display Movement" function, by which a movement equal to one physical display size may be employed using a pointer

in either a vertical or horizontal direction from the current view. (See, e.g., Dauerer at col. 7, lines 32-42.) Even such navigation does not provide for individually selecting a screen located at any position within the workspace as claimed, but merely permits adjacent movement vertically or horizontally in display-sized increments.

For at least these reasons, Dauerer does not disclose or suggest the claim features that each logical screen is individually selectable for navigation within the logical main application workspace, and moving the computer system display from displaying a currently displayed logical screen to displaying a selected logical screen, the selected logical screen being any screen in the logical main application workspace. Accordingly, Dauerer, does not anticipate the invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 37, and the dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. The rejection of all claims, therefore, should be withdrawn.

B. Associating Sub-application Windows With Screens

As stated above, claims 2, 12, 13, 38, 48, and 49 have been amended to recite associating a plurality of sub-application windows with respective *logical screens* within the logical main application workspace. The purported screens of Dauerer lack such features.

The passages of Dauerer cited by the Examiner as to these claims relate to the placement or movement of application windows within the application workspace beyond the physical display area. (See, e.g., Dauerer at col. 2, lines 23-26 and 51-60; col. 4, lines 33-35; col. 6, lines 20-29.) As such, the Examiner appears correct that in the system of Dauerer, the sub-application windows may be associated generally with a “location” within the application workspace, comparably to the previous recitation in the claims.

By contrast, however, in Applicant’s system the sub-application windows in fact are associated with particular **screens** to define sub-application window locations within the continuous logical main application workspace. (See, e.g., Application at paragraphs [0045] and [0052].) For example, paragraph [0045] of the current application states:

Also illustrated in FIG. 3 are additional sub-application windows 58 arranged throughout the application workspace 54. As illustrated, ***the sub-application windows 58 can be associated with one particular screen 56.*** A particular sub-application window 58 will be associated with a screen 56 when that application window is "fully contained" within the corresponding screen 56. Alternatively, if the sub-application window 58 overlies two or more screens 56, that sub-application window 58 will be associated with the screen 56 in which a majority of the sub-application window 58 resides.

(Emphasis added.) Paragraph [0052] in part describes how a sub-application window is associated with a new screen when moved to such new screen.

As indicated above with respect to claims 1 and 37, after the initial definition of the workspace ("Define Virtual Area" function), the system of Dauerer does not employ a "screens" concept for navigating the workspace. Figs. 4-12 of Dauerer, depicting the various navigation operations, all lack the grid of multiple display areas shown in Fig. 3. As stated above, such grid is ***lacking in Dauerer because none of the various navigation mechanisms relies upon a screens concept to navigate among or manipulate the sub-application windows.*** Accordingly, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Dauerer that any of the sub-application windows is logically associated with a purported "screen" area 56 of Fig. 3.

For at least these reasons, Dauerer does not disclose or suggest the claim features of associating a plurality of sub-application windows with respective logical screens within the logical main application workspace. Accordingly, Dauerer does not anticipate the invention as recited in dependent claims 2, 5, 8, 12, 13, 38, 41, 44, 48, and 49, and any claims dependent thereon are patentable for at least the same reasons. The rejection of such claims, therefore, should be withdrawn for at least these additional reasons.

Applicant further notes the Examiner's previous conclusion (now withdrawn) that dependent claims 3, 4, 39, and 40 recite allowable subject matter. Accordingly, new independent claims 75 and 77 have been added to recite comparable subject matter of

claims 3 and 39 in independent form. Related new dependent claims 76 and 79 also have been added to recite subject matter comparable to claims 4 and 40.

As representative, claim 3 depends from claim 2 and recites “code that increases the number of logical screens when, by user action, one of the sub-application windows is moved to a new location outside the current dimensions of the continuous logical main application workspace.” Comparable features are recited in method claim 39, and new claims 75 and 77. By virtue of the features of such claims, therefore, Applicant’s system employs the association between a sub-application window and a respective screen to provide a mechanism for expanding the size of the workspace by moving a sub-application window outside the current workspace dimensions. The Examiner has withdrawn his conclusion that such features constitute allowable subject matter and asserts Dauerer discloses such features.

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s interpretation of Dauerer in this respect. The Examiner first cites to Dauerer at col. 4, lines 63-67 as disclosing such features. This passage describes an “anchored object” which moves with the viewable area (physical display 54) as the viewable area is moved within the workspace. Dauerer goes on to state: “The anchored object 58 **cannot be moved outside the physical display** 54.” (Dauerer at col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 1, emphasis added.) It follows, therefore, that an anchored object simply cannot be moved outside the current dimensions of the continuous logical main application workspace as claimed.

The Examiner also cites to Dauerer at col. 5, lines 35-40 as disclosing the features of claims 3 and 39. This passage describes how the workspace dimensions may be adjusted by employing a pointing device, such as a mouse pointer, to drag one of the edges or a corner of the workspace. (See Dauerer Fig. 3, elements 52, 52a, and 66.) In contrast to the claimed invention, such operation of Dauerer does not expand the workspace by dragging (or otherwise moving) **a sub-application window** outside the current workspace dimension.

Accordingly, dependent claims 3 and 39, and new independent claims 75 and 77 (and thus dependent claims 4, 40, 76, and 78) are patentable for at least these additional reasons.

C. Selecting Screens By Navigation Box or Drop Down Menu

As stated above, claims 18 and 54 have been amended to recite a navigation box that includes a representation of the continuous logical main application workspace **including an indication of each logical screen** within the workspace. Comparable features are recited in new independent claims 79 and 86, which recite comparable navigation box features in independent form. (Related dependent claim 80-85 and 87-92 have been added, which are comparable to dependent claims 19-24 and 55-60.) In addition, claims 25 and 61 recite a drop down menu from which a user can select one of the plurality of logical screens. The system of Dauerer does not disclose or suggest such features.

Regarding the navigation box recited in claims 18, 54, 79, and 86, the Examiner relies on Dauerer at col. 6, lines 20-29 as disclosing such features. The Examiner appears to equate the “reduced virtual display 52” to the claimed navigation box. The reduced virtual display 52 actually is described in more detail in Dauerer at col. 5, lines 47-62, as depicted in Fig. 6.

The reduced virtual display 52 of Dauerer differs from the navigation box as recited in amended claims 18 and 54, and new claims 79 and 86. The reduced virtual display 52 of Dauerer does not contain an indication of each logical screen as claimed. For example, Dauerer Fig. 6 lacks a grid of the purported screens as contained in Dauerer Fig. 3. In contrast, the navigation box 84 of Applicant’s system contains an indication of each logical screen S1-S9. (See, e.g., Application Fig. 7.) As a result, a user of **Applicant’s system can navigate the workspace by selecting a particular screen from within the navigation box, clicking on the selection, and jumping to that screen within the logical main application workspace.** As demonstrated above with respect to claims 1 and 37, Dauerer does not disclose or suggest any navigation mechanism based upon an individual selection of a purported screen. The reduced

virtual display 52, therefore, does not contain an indication of the purported screens as recited in claims 18, 54, 79, and 86.

Additionally, sub-applications within the main application workspace can be moved to another logical screen by clicking on the iconic representation of the sub-application in the navigator box, and dragging the icon to any user chosen logical screen as represented in the navigator box. Dauerer does not disclose or suggest any such feature. Accordingly, Dauerer does not anticipate claims 23, 24, 84, and 85 of the application.

Furthermore, being recited in dependent claims, the claimed navigation box recited in claims 18 and 54 is present in addition to the features of the respective base claims. In other words, the navigation box is displayed as a part of the physically viewable work area ***in addition*** to content contained in a displayed logical screen as recited in claims 1 and 37. Similar features also are incorporated into new claims 79 and 86. In the system of Dauerer, the reduced virtual display 52 ***is*** the physically viewable work area. It is simply a “reduced resolution application window to improve the display performance” (Dauerer at col 5, lines 56-57). Accordingly, the reduced virtual display of Dauerer is not a navigation box displayed in combination with the content of a single displayed screen as in the claimed invention.

In addition, because Dauerer does not disclose or suggest any navigation mechanism based upon an individual selection of a purported screen anywhere in the workspace, Dauerer also does not disclose or suggest the features of claims 25 and 61. In other words, Dauerer does not disclose or suggest a drop down menu from which an individual screen positioned anywhere within the logical application workspace may be selected for navigation.

For at least these reasons, Dauerer does not disclose or suggest the claim features of a navigation box and drop menu for the selection of a particular screen for navigation positioned anywhere within the logical application workspace. Accordingly, Dauerer does not anticipate the invention as recited in dependent claims 18 and 54, nor new independent claims 79 and 86. Dauerer also does not render obvious dependent

claims 25 and 61. Any claims dependent thereon are patentable for at least the same reasons. The rejection of such claims, therefore, should be withdrawn for at least these additional reasons.

D. Anderson Does Not Disclose the Deficiencies of Dauerer

Anderson does not disclose or suggest the above deficiencies of Dauerer. As explained in response to previous Office Actions, Anderson does not disclose any features comparable to the claimed screens. Anderson discloses a system that only arranges content within the physically viewable area defined by a physical computer system display. One skilled in the art, therefore, would not combine Anderson with a system such as Dauerer for navigating a workspace larger than the viewable area.

In this vein, most claims stand rejected based on Dauerer as an anticipating reference, with Anderson being cited as to features of certain dependent claims. Anderson discloses displaying multiple desktops on a single display. Each desktop may be displayed as a scaled pane having dimensions proportional to, but less than, the dimensions of a non-scaled desktop. Alternatively, one desktop may be maximized to substantially the entire physical display, with the remaining desktops being tiled in the status bar. The user may switch among the desktops to make a selected desktop active from either the paned view or from the status bar. (See, e.g., paragraphs [0008], [0034], [0037], figures 5-8.) The desktops do not form a contiguous logical workspace and instead are each logically isolated from one another. The system of Anderson, therefore, would not be applied by one skilled in the art to navigate a workspace beyond a physical display area as described in Dauerer.

Accordingly, insofar as the claimed screens concept is lacking in Anderson, the claimed invention is patentable over the combination of Dauerer and Anderson for at least the above reasons.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-28, 35-46, 48-50, 52-64, and 71-92 are allowable, and the application is in condition for allowance. A prompt action

to such end is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988, Reference No. CUTCP0103US.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

By /MDavidGalin/
M. David Galin; Reg. No. 41,767

1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
Telephone: (216) 621-1113
Facsimile: (216) 621-6165